A. Uniqueness, the amount of active troops in the U.S. military is decreasing **Lopez**[[1]](#footnote-1) Nov ’10

By the time the Army meets its goal to have Soldiers home for twice the time they’re deployed, the service could face the problem of having nearly one in five Soldiers unable to deploy. Today, **nearly 14.5 percent of Soldiers** in a brigade combat team **are unable to deploy[,]** by the unit’s latest arrival date in theater, or LAD. That number is **up from** a little over **10 percent in 2007. By 2012, it’s expected** the number will **[to] be as high as 16 percent, said** Lt. Gen**.** Thomas P.Bostick**,** the Army’s **deputy chief of staff**, G-1. “We don’t want it to grow, but the reality is, we’re tracking what’s happening with our Soldiers and we’re making our best assumptions and assessment of what’s going to happen in the future,” Bostick said. The general spoke Oct. 26 during the Association of the United States Army’s annual meeting and exposition in Washington, D.C.,

He furthers:

**Non-deployable Soldiers are a “huge issue** we are working **across the Army that we have** got **to fix,” Bostick said. The need for additional Soldiers can** also **be attributed to** the service’s wounded warrior program, Bostick said. The number of Soldiers in that program is increasing. “We thought that number was going to actually start coming down, but with what is happening in **Afghanistan**, the number is going the other direction,” he said**.** Today, there are about 9,000 Soldiers in the Wounded Warrior Program from both the active and Reserve components, Bostick said. The general said the temporary end-strength increase is not forever. **By September 2011, the Army will have to drawdown again to 547,000, the end strength prescribed in law.**

B. Link, when a juveniles is convicted of a felony, they can’t go to the military: **Young**[[2]](#footnote-2)

In addition to receiving an adult sentence and possibly serving time in an adult prison, **[J]uveniles convicted in criminal court** may suffer other long-term legal consequences. Depending on the laws of their state, they may • Be subject to criminal court jurisdiction for any subsequent offense committed as a juvenile • Have their conviction a matter of public record • Have to report their conviction in employment applications • Lose the right to vote, sometimes for life • **[l]ose the right to serve in the military.**

Further, juvenile transfer increases recidivism, while rehabilitation reduces recidivism and allows these offenders to succeed in the military. Redding[[3]](#footnote-3)

In sum, to date, **six large-scale studies have been conducted on the specific deterrent effects of transfer. These studies used large sample sizes** (between 494 and 5,476 participants)**, different methodologies** (natural experiment across two jurisdictions, matched groups within the same jurisdictions, or statistical controls)**, multiple measures of recidivism, and were conducted in five jurisdictions** (Florida, New Jersey, New York, Minnesota, Pennsylvania) **having different types of transfer laws** (automatic, prosecutorial, or judicial)**. The strong consistency in results across the studies is all the more compelling given that they used different samples and methodologies, thereby providing a degree of convergent validity** for the findings**. All** of the studies **found [that]** higher recidivism rates among offenders who had been transferred to criminal court, compared with those who were retained in the juvenile system. This held true even for offenders who only received a sentence of probation from the criminal court. Thus, the extant research provides sound evidence that transferring juvenile offenders to the criminal court does not engender community protection by reducing recidivism. On the contrary, **transfer substantially increases recidivism.** A recent review of the extant research on transfer conducted by the Centers for Disease Central arrived at the same conclusion (McGowan et al., 2007). Only two apparent exceptions challenge this pattern of findings. For nonviolent property offenders, the effects of transfer remain unclear, with one study finding that transfer had no effect on recidivism (Fagan, 1996) and another finding that transfer decreased recidivism (Winner et al., 1997), but with two studies (conducted in the same jurisdiction as the first two studies) finding that it increased recidivism (Fagan et al., 2003; Lanza-Kaduce et al., 2005). In addition, with respect to drug offenders, two studies (Fagan, 1996; Fagan et al., 2003) found decreased recidivism rates among those tried in the criminal court.

Thus prosecuting young offenders as juveniles significantly decreases

their risk of future criminal activity, as they are rehabilitated, making them prime military candidates. Moreover, even if some juveniles still can’t serve in the military there is a benefit to the AFF since if juveniles are tried as adults they can never serve since they have a criminal record.

C. Internal link: Young offenders constitute a large proportion of recruits. Bender[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Nearly 12 percent of Army recruits** who entered basic training **this year [had]** needed a special waiver for those with **criminal records**, a dramatic increase over last year and 2 1/2 times the percentage four years ago, according to new Army statistics obtained by the Globe**.**

With less than three months left in the fiscal year, 11.6 percent of new active-duty and Army Reserve troops in 2007 have received a so-called "moral waiver," up from 7.9 percent in fiscal year 2006, according to figures from the US Army Recruiting Command. In fiscal 2003 and 2004, soldiers granted waivers accounted for 4.6 percent of new recruits; in 2005, it was 6.2 percent. **Army officials acknowledge** privately **that the increase** in moral waivers **reflects the difficulty of signing up sufficient numbers of recruits** to sustain an increasingly unpopular war in Iraq; the Army fell short of its monthly recruiting goals in May and June**.** Since Oct. 1, 2006, when the fiscal year began, more than 8,000 of the roughly 69,000 recruits have been granted waivers for offenses ranging in seriousness from misdemeanors such as vandalism to felonies such as burglary and aggravated assault. Army officials say **the** majority of such **recruits** committed relatively minor offenses and **have not been in prison.** They point out that **waivers are granted only after a careful review of each soldier's history -- and only when the applicant has shown remorse or changed behavior**… **Applicants with** more than one felony -- or with **a single conviction for a more serious crime such as homicide,** sexual violence, or drug trafficking -- **are not eligible.** "In most cases we see, the charges were from a period of time when the applicant was young and immature," said a two-page statement from the Army Recruiting Command, based in Fort Knox, Ky., provided in response to queries from the Globe. "We look at the recent history such as employment, schooling, references, and signs of remorse and changed behavior since the incident occurred as part of the waiver process," the statement said. "The Army does not rehabilitate enlistees who receive waivers; they have already overcome their mistakes."

D. Impact: We are on the brink of having the minimum number of recruits possible to be military ready. But, Military readiness is critical to deter a global power rival, **Khalilzad[[5]](#footnote-5)**:

A global rival to the United States could emerge for several reasons. **Because the main deterrent to the rise of another global rival is the military power of the U**nited **S**tates, **an inadequate level of U.S. military capability could facilitate such an event**. This capability should be measured not only in terms of the strength of other countries, but also in terms of the U.S. ability to carry out the strategy outlined here. U.S. tradition makes the prospect of defense cuts below this level a serious possibility: historically, the United States has made this error on several occasions by downsizing excessively. It faces the same danger again for the longer term. To discourage the rise of another global rival or to be in a strong position to deal with the problem should one arise, focusing U.S. military planning for the future on Korea and the Persian Gulf, plus increased ability for LRC operations, is inadequate. Over time, although the threat from North Korea will probably disappear, other larger threats could emerge. As an alternative, **the U**nited **S**tates **should consider moving toward sizing its forces largely by adopting the requirement that they be capable of simultaneously defeating the most plausible military challenges to critical U.S. interests** that might be created by the two next most powerful military forces in the world that are not allied with the United States. Such a force should allow the United States to protect its interests in Asia, Europe, and the Persian Gulf. Such a force-sizing principle does not mean that U.S. forces have to be numerically as large as the combined forces of these two powers. It means **that they should be capable of defeating them given** relatively **specific** nearsimultaneous **scenarios** of great importance to the United States -- **a Gulf and Asia scenario;** a Europe and Asia scenario; or Asian and Gulf scenarios nearly **simultaneously**. Such an approach would give the United States a flexible global capability for substantial operations.

U.S. withdrawal would leave behind a power vacuum spurring multiple nuclear wars, Ferguson[[6]](#footnote-6):

Meanwhile, limited **nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East**. In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, the great plagues of aids and malaria would continue their deadly work. The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. **If the United States retreats from global hegemony**--its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier--**its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony, or even a return to the good old balance of power**. Be careful what you wish for. **The alternative to unipolarity** would not be multipolarity at all. It **would be** apolarity--**a global vacuum of power. And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.**

Nuke war means extinction, Hogan[[7]](#footnote-7):

In the fall of 1983, a group of scientists led by Carl Sagan introduced a new strain of apocalyptic discourse into the freeze debate: the rhetoric of nuclear winter. Simply stated, the theory of nuclear winter held that **even a small exchange** of nuclear weapons—on the order, perhaps, of 500 of the world’s 18,000 nuclear weapons—**would throw so much** dirt**, soot**, and smoke **into the atmosphere that the earth would be plunged into** darkness and subfreezing temperatures, a **“winter” lasting long enough to create** “a real possibility of the **extinction** of the human species” Unlike doomsday scenarios that preceded it, **the theory** of nuclear winter **was based upon “extensive scientific studies**,” **and** it had been **“endorsed by a large number of scientists.”**

1. Quickest and most probable link to extinction, we are on the brink right now, sending more people to jail will significantly reduce military recruitments, leading two multiple nuke wars and extinction. Extinction comes first: a. It functions as an empirical constraint on all moral theories—its rationally impossible to accept the destruction of all human life since that would prevent any benefit—empirical logic come first—it tests analytical claims in the real world b. If you will and end, you must also will the necessary means—i.e. if he wills treat people as ends then it follows that he must first will that people are alive to have that framework.

2. extremely specific link chain

3. Structural harm: we allow other countries to become center of powers, in which caes we have infinite impacts of terrorism and harms from the middle east.

4. Quanitifed args

Iraq Link

Loss of U.S. troops will lead to multiple sectarian conflicts as well as an effort by many middle eastern countries, namely Iran and Syria, to shape Iraq as a territorial pawn shattering U.S. legitimacy.

Citing Assistant Proffessor Veysel Ayhan, June 11 2010 (*Expert Warns U.S. withdrawal*, http://www.theiraqidinar.com/expert-warns-us-withdrawal-may-have-dire-consequences-for-war-torn-iraq/)

**Ayhan draws a pretty pessimistic sketch of the impact in 2012 of a probable withdrawal of the US from Iraq; he holds that such a withdrawal would lead to a bloody internal war and even regional warfare that will affect the entire region. “The SOFA [Status of Forces Agreement] signed on Nov. 17, 2008 envisages a gradual withdrawal of American forces from Iraq by Dec. 31, 2011.**

**Therefore, if no unexpected developments take place, the American military presence in Iraq will be over by January 2012. It is obvious that the US failed to maintain security in this country; it is also obvious that the US failed to have a political, economic or military influence in Iraq. The state of instability and chaos in Iraq may result in the emergence of the need for further American protectionism. At this point, the increase of the American military presence in Gulf countries may be taken into consideration.”**

**Noting that the country is becoming more instable as the time for the withdrawal approaches, Ayhan asserts that the violent groups are preparing for warfare in the aftermath of the withdrawal. “The year 2012 points to serious uncertainties and dangers; the most visible threat and danger is that the country may be dragged into a state of internal warfare in a post-US period. The primary factor that will prevent the eruption of a bloody internal war is the American military presence in the country. … Therefore, 2012 may be the start of a bloody civil war that will lead to the partition of Iraq.”**

**Arguing that a wholesale withdrawal would not be proper, Ayhan asserts that Iraq would not be the same after such a withdrawal and adds that a UN intervention may be considered in such a case. Asked how Iraq would look if this scenario was realized , Ayhan speaks of two options: “Iraq may be divided into three, four or more parts. Or, other countries in the region may expand to conquer Iraqi territory. Obviously, this would not happen peacefully.”**

**Noting that both scenarios will closely affect a number of countries including Turkey, Ayhan stresses that the greatest danger will be witnessed when other countries in the region seek to influence Iraq in the fulfillment of their own interests and goals. “The fact that Iraq accused Syria after a deadly wave of attacks carried out in the Green Zone in Baghdad, Iran’s influence over the Shiite groups in the country and Turkey’s attempt to open a consulate in the Kurdish region should be viewed as attempts by regional countries to maintain control and expand their sphere of influence in the country.”**

**Noting that the countries in the region do not have a common policy on Iraq, Ayhan stresses that the decisions taken at meetings of countries neighboring Iraq did not reflect the presence of a common resolution. Arguing that the countries in the region have conflicting interests with respect to Iraq, Ayhan further says: “For regional countries, it is hard to find a any common ground with respect to the future of Iraq. These countries have differing views and ambitions over the territorial integrity of Iraq, its constitutional, administrative and political order as well as the representation of religious sects in the political power.”**

**Noting that Turkey has stated its position most visibly with respect to Iraq’s future, Ayhan argues that some countries, including Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Oman, favor the territorial integrity of the country. Asked about the stance of other actors regarding this issue, Ayhan says: “The views of Kuwait, Iran and Syria on the territorial integrity of the country are ambiguous for different reasons. The Kuwaiti regime is skeptical that a strong Iraqi government may have the intention to again take control over part of its land. Iran and Syria have some doubts on the repercussions of the creation of a separate Kurdish state, whereas they are also considering the security risks involved in the foundation of a separate Shia or Sunni state. Yemen may prefer a partitioned Iraq instead of an Iraq under Shia control. Saudi Arabia may oppose the emergence of a Shiite state in Iraq because of its Shiite minority. Iran wants a controllable and manageable Iraq. It may seek to create a weak and federal Iraq to make sure that Baghdad does not become a strong player. Saddam Hussein not only declared war against Iran and Kuwait but also threatened Syria and Turkey. Therefore, the countries in the region would not like to see Iraq as a threat again.”**

**Speaking on the role that Turkey would assume in this process considering that it will be affected most by the developments taking place, Ayhan says the cooperation agreement signed with the Iraqi government on July 10, 2008 and the 48 additional protocols adopted are significant for the preservation of Turkish interests. “Iran sees Turkey’s eagerness to maintain dialogue with Syria and Iraq as its ambition to expand its sphere of influence. This causes tension. Iran has viewed Iraq as a rival and a threat throughout history. Therefore, it will seek to use the opportunity it got in the aftermath of the invasion in 2003.”**

**Noting that a number of countries including Turkey would strongly oppose the emergence of another Shiite state in the region, Ayhan argues: “It is certain that Iraq will become a venue of sectarian clashes and ethnic conflicts in the aftermath of 2012. Despite that the American administration won the war against the Saddam regime, it failed to prevent Iraq from turning into a chaotic state. US interests in this country are not over. But obviously, it will not be able to achieve its goals by relying on coercion and military power. The stabilization of Iraq will be a duty that falls to the states in the region. However, a clash of interests of those states may lead to further tension in the region.”**

**The opening of a consulate in the Kurdish region by Turkey should be viewed as the start of a new policy, according to Ayhan, who argues that Turkey is seeking to develop measures against developments after 2012: “Turkey is now seeking to develop ties with Sunnis, Kurds and Shiites. This means that Turkey is eager to fill the vacuum that will be left after the US withdrawal from Iraq. Turkey wants to deliver a message that it will not remain silent vis-à-vis developments turning Iraq into a satellite state by maintaining ties with the three groups in Iraq; it is also seeking to have power to influence the probable developments in this country as well.”**

**Ayhan continues: “The decision of the Turkish authorities to open a consulate in Arbil may lead to the elimination of the psychological barrier between the two parties and the emergence of a greater role and sphere of influence for Turkey. In such a case, Turkey will be able to have a greater influence in the country. It is also obvious that the US has made its decision on withdrawal without achieving its goals in the country. It is impossible to foresee the consequences of a probable withdrawal; however, we do not hold the expectation that such a withdrawal will lead to a more stable era and situation in Iraq.”**

Iraq Pullout

Iraq pullout causes Middle-Eastern nuclear war

Gerecht, resident fellow at American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2007

(Reuel, “The Consequences of Failure in Iraq”, Jan 15, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.25407,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp)

If we leave Iraq any time soon, the battle for Baghdad will probably lead to a conflagration that consumes all of Arab Iraq, and quite possibly Kurdistan, too. Once the Shia become both badly bloodied and victorious, raw nationalist and religious passions will grow. A horrific fight with the Sunni Arabs will inevitably draw in support from the ferociously anti-Shiite Sunni religious establishments in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and on the Shiite side from Iran. It will probably destroy most of central Iraq and whet the appetite of Shiite Arab warlords, who will by then dominate their community, for a conflict with the Kurds. If the Americans stabilize Arab Iraq, which means occupying the Sunni triangle, this won't happen. A strong, aggressive American military presence in Iraq can probably halt the radicalization of the Shiite community. Imagine an Iraq modeled on the Lebanese Hezbollah and Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps. The worst elements in the Iranian regime are heavily concentrated in the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and the Ministry of Intelligence, the two organizations most active inside Iraq. The Lebanese Hezbollah is also present giving tutorials. These forces need increasing strife to prosper. Imagine Iraqi Shiites, battle-hardened in a vicious war with Iraq's Arab Sunnis, spiritually and operationally linking up with a revitalized and aggressive clerical dictatorship in Iran. Imagine the Iraqi Sunni Islamic militants, driven from Iraq, joining up with groups like al Qaeda, living to die killing Americans. Imagine the Hashemite monarchy of Jordan overwhelmed with hundreds of thousands of Iraqi Sunni Arab refugees. The Hashemites have been lucky and clever since World War II. They've escaped extinction several times. Does anyone want to take bets that the monarchy can survive the implantation of an army of militant, angry Iraqi Sunni Arabs? For those who believe that the Israeli-Palestinian peace process is the epicenter of the Middle East, the mass migration of Iraq's Sunni Arabs into Jordan will bury what small chances remain that the Israelis and Palestinians will find an accommodation. With Jordan in trouble, overflowing with viciously anti-American and anti-Israeli Iraqis, peaceful Palestinian evolution on the West Bank of the Jordan river is about as likely as the discovery of the Holy Grail. The repercussions throughout the Middle East of the Sunni-Shiite clash in Iraq are potentially so large it's difficult to digest. Sunni Arabs in Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia will certainly view a hard-won and bloody Shiite triumph in Iraq as an enormous Iranian victory. The Egyptians or the Saudis or both will go for their own nukes. What little chance remains for the Americans and the Europeans to corral peacefully the clerical regime's nuclear-weapons aspirations will end with a Shiite-Sunni death struggle in Mesopotamia, which the Shia will inevitably win. The Israelis, who are increasingly likely to strike preemptively the major Iranian nuclear sites before the end of George Bush's presidency, will feel even more threatened, especially when the Iranian regime underscores its struggle against the Zionist enemy as a means of compensating for its support to the bloody Shiite conquest in Iraq. With America in full retreat from Iraq, the clerical regime, which has often viewed terrorism as a tool of statecraft, could well revert to the mentality and tactics that produced the bombing of Khobar Towers in 1996. If the Americans are retreating, hit them. That would not be just a radical Shiite view; it was the learned estimation of Osama bin Laden and his kind before 9/11. It's questionable to argue that the war in Iraq has advanced the radical Sunni holy war against the United States. There should be no question, however, that an American defeat in Mesopotamia would be the greatest psychological triumph ever for anti-American jihadists. Al Qaeda and its militant Iraqi allies could dominate western Iraq for years--it could take awhile for the Shiites to drive them out.
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